



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/446,583	12/22/1999	PHILIP C. LEVERIDGE	36-1302	2585

7590 01/13/2003

NIXON & VANDERHYE
1100 NORTH GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

16

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/446,583

Applicant(s)

LEVERIDGE ET AL.

Examiner

April L. Baugh

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant has amended claims 1-10, 14-16, and 18, and therefore claims 1-19 are now pending.

Specification

The proposed specification corrections received on November 15, 2002 have been accepted.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed November 15, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Levergood et al. does not disclose (i) storing status data indicating an identifier issued to an authenticated user's client terminal as being a validating identifier, and (ii) validating document requests by a resource server by checking the status data. However it is the examiner's position that Levergood et al. teaches (i) storing status data indicating an identifier issued to an authenticated user's client terminal as being a validating identifier (column 3, lines 50-55 and 66-67 through column 4, lines 1-4 and column 8, lines 1-3 and 9-12 and column 115, lines 15-21), and (ii) validating document requests by a resource server by checking the status data (column 6, lines 58-65 and column 7, lines 51-53 and 63-67 and Fig.2B) and therefore independent claims 1 and 9 are rejected as well as dependent claims 2-8 and 10-19.

Art Unit: 2143

Levergood et al. discloses, '...SID comprises a compact ASCII string that encodes a user identifier... an expiration time... The content server logs the GET request in the transaction database by recording the tagged URL, the client IP address, and the current time.' The examiner's position is that the expiration time within the SID is a determinant of whether the identifier is valid. And the expiration time is stored within the transaction database. Therefore the stored status data (expiration time) indicates the validity of the identifier. Levergood et al. also teaches that '...a valid SID allows the client to access all controlled files within a protection domain without requiring further authorization. A protection domain is... a collection of controlled files... if the relative link points to a controlled page in a different protection domain, the SID is no longer valid...' The examiner's position is that a collection of controlled files is a form of stored status data, and this determines the extent of the identifiers validity. Therefore the identifier is not valid when attempting to access files outside of the collection (stored status data).

Levergood et al. discloses, 'Upon receiving the GET request, the authentication server queries an account database to determine whether the user is authorized to access the requested document. A preferred account database may contain a user profile which includes information for identifying purposes, such as client IP address and password, ...'. The examiner's position is that upon a GET request (document request) the account database (status data) is queried to determine whether the user is authorized to make the request (the request is valid).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by US Patent No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al.

Regarding claim 1, Levergood et al. teaches a method of operating an authenticating server system for authenticating users at client terminals connected via a data communications network (column 3, lines 8-9), to control access to a document stored on a resource server, said method comprising performing the following steps in said server system: storing authentication details of authorized users (column 6, lines 61-63); receiving authentication data for a user from a client terminal of the user, and validating said authentication data by reference to said stored authentication details (column 3, lines 25-26 and column 6, lines 58-60); issuing an identifier for the user's client terminal to said terminal for storage thereon (column 3, lines 17-20), the identifier being transmitted in such a manner that the identifier is retransmitted by said user's

Art Unit: 2143

client terminal with document requests directed at said resource server (column 3, lines 12-17); storing status data indicating said identifier to be a validated identifier of a terminal of a currently authenticated user (column 3, lines 50-55 and 66-67 through column 4, lines 1-4 and column 8, lines 1-3 and 9-12 and column 115, lines 15-21), in response to the receipt and validation of the authentication data; and enabling said resource server to validate a request for said document from the user's client terminal, which request includes said identifier, by checking said status data on receipt of said document request (column 6, lines 58-65 and column 7, lines 51-53 and 63-67 and Fig. 2B).

Referring to claim 3, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said authentication step comprises receiving said identifier from said user's client terminal with said authentication data (column 3, lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 4, Levergood et al teaches a method according to claim 3, wherein a new identifier is issued to said user's client terminal if said authentication data is invalid (column 5, lines 46-49).

Referring to claim 8, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 1, comprising authenticating said user for access to a plurality of Web servers located in the same Internet domain (column 3, lines 66-67); and enabling each of said Web servers to validate document requests from the user's client terminal, which requests include said identifier (column 3, lines 44-45), by checking said status data on receipt of a document request (column 6, lines 58-60).

Regarding claim 9, Levergood et al. teaches a method of operating an authenticating server system for authenticating users at client terminals connected via a data communications network (column 3, lines 8-9), to control access to a document stored on a resource server, said

Art Unit: 2143

method comprising performing the following steps in said server system: storing authentication details of authorized users (column 6, lines 61-63); performing remote authentication of a user by reference to said stored authentication details (column 3, lines 25-26 and column 6, lines 58-65 and column 7, lines 51-53 and 63-67 and Fig.2B) and during said remote authentication step generating status data, distinguishing said user from other users which are not currently authenticated (column 6, lines 61-63), and a secret encryption key shared with said user (column 5, lines 61-65); storing said status data in storage means accessible to said plurality of resource servers to check an authentication status of said user by using an identifier for the user's client terminal received in a service request (column 3, lines 13-16 and column 6, lines 58-65 and column 7, lines 51-53 and 63-67 and Fig.2B); and storing said shared secret key in a data store accessible by at least one of said resource servers for use during communications with said user (column 5, lines 61-65).

Referring to claim 10, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said remote authenticating step comprises issuing a challenge to the user's client terminal, receiving a response to said challenge, and verifying said response (column 6, lines 45-49 and 58-60).

Referring to claim 11, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, further comprising updating said status data for an authenticated user following said storing step (column 7, lines 31-34 and 63-64).

Regarding claim 13, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 11, wherein said updating step is performed in response to access by one of said resource servers to said status data (column 8, lines 52-55).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 15, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said identifier is an IP address of the user's client terminal (column 1, lines 39-41).

Referring to claim 16, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said authentication step comprises issuing said identifier to the user's client terminal (column 3, lines 30-32).

Regarding claim 17, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said status data is stored in a data store which said resource servers are each able to access (column 6, lines 61-63 and column 7, lines 31-34).

Referring to claim 18, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said authentication details include data identifying the rights of access of individual users to one or more of said resource servers (column 3, lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 19, Levergood et al. teaches an authenticating server system adapted to perform the method of claim 1 (column 5, lines 48-49 and column 6, lines 58-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Patent No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. in view of Kirsch.

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 2, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said identifier is transmitted to said user's client terminal (column 3, lines 30-32).

Levergood et al. does not teach the transmission of the identifier in a cookie. Kirsch teaches that said identifier is transmitted in a cookie to said user's client terminal (column 3, lines 14-16 and column 13, lines 11-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by transmitting the identifier in a cookie because it is a more secure manner of storage and transport of identification data.

5. Claims 5, 6, 7, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. in view of See et al.

Regarding claim 5, Levergood et al. teaches of an identifier (column 1, lines 39-41), and the reception of an invalid authenticator from said user's client terminal (column 7, lines 13-14).

Levergood et al. does not teach that the identifier contains the number of times an invalid authenticator was received. See et al. teaches said identifier comprises data indicating the number of times an invalid authenticator has been received from said user's client terminal (column 3, lines 23-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by having the identifier contain the number of times an invalid authenticator was received because a user can be denied access if they submit multiple invalid authenticators thus providing the system with added security and access control.

Art Unit: 2143

Referring to claim 6, Levergood et al. teaches of an identifier (column 1, lines 39-41), and the reception of an invalid authenticator from said user's client terminal (column 7, lines 13-14).

Levergood et al. does not teach that the system will not issue identifiers to the user if an identifier received from that user shows that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators have been received from the user. See et al. teaches said method comprising issuing no further identifier to said user's client terminal if an identifier received from said user's client terminal indicates that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators have been received from said user's client terminal (column 6, lines 23-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by not issuing identifiers to the user if an identifier received from that user shows that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators have been received from the user because this provides the system with added security and access control by not allowing unauthorized users access to server information.

Regarding claim 7, Levergood et al. teaches of an identifier (column 1, lines 39-41).

Levergood et al. does not teach of timing out of an identifier. See et al. teaches of timing out of said identifier of a terminal of a currently authenticated user if no document request is received from said user's client terminal for a predetermined period (column 7, lines 32-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by timing out an identifier because if a user were to forget to logout of a session another could use that workstation to access information that they are not authorized to view and

Art Unit: 2143

the timing out of the identifier lessens the chance of this happening therefore increasing the security of the system.

Referring to claim 12, Levergood et al. teaches of an updating step (column 7, lines 31-34 and 63-64).

Levergood et al. does not teach of the updating step being performed because of a time-out. See et al. teaches said updating step is performed in response to a time-out associated with said status data (column 7, lines 32-36 and lines 37-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by performing the updating step because of a time-out because this will give the system up-to-date information on the state of the workstation.

Referring to claim 14, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 12, wherein said updating step is performed in response to a request by the user's client terminal (column 4, lines 1-4).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to server access control in general:

US Pat No 5,506,961 to Carlson et al.

US Pat No 6,377,994 to Ault et al.

Art Unit: 2143

US Pat No 5,812,776 to Gifford.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9149 for regular communications and 703-746-9149 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/446,583

Page 12

Art Unit: 2143

ALB

January 9, 2003



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100